DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 273 325 JC 860 477

AUTHOR Alkin, Marvin C.; Ruskus, Joan
TITLE EOPS Operational Program Review: 1984-1985.
INSTITUTION Educational Evaluation Associates, Northridge, CA.
SPONS AGENCY California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE Sep 85
NOTE 74p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Counseling; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Evaluation Methods; Outreach Programs; Program Administration; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; State Programs; State Surveys; Student Personnel Services; Transfer Programs; Tutorial Programs; Two Year Colleges; *Two Year College Students
IDENTIFIERS *California Community Colleges; *Extended Opportunity Programs and Services

ABSTRACT

A synthesis is provided of the information collected between September 1984 and April 1985 by Operational Program Review (OPR) teams regarding 22 California community college Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) programs. Chapter 1 explains the purposes and evaluation methods of OPRs, and outlines the general characteristics of the EOPS programs reviewed in 1984-85, looking at student demographics, goals, high school graduation status, and general profiles. Chapter 2 offers information on the EOPS; its intended clientele; its outreach, recruitment, counseling, tutoring, transfer transition, financial aid, and other services; and its personnel. Chapter 3 highlights the most outstanding strengths and exemplary features of the 22 programs, in the areas of: (1) management services; (2) outreach services; (3) instructional development and services; (4) counseling services; (5) transition services; (6) special activities; and (7) financial aid. Chapter 4 looks at ways EOPS can be improved, pointing to the following major themes within the OPR findings: the need for more thorough documentation of program services, the importance of providing over-and-above services, the impact of campus politics on EOPS programs, and the need to coordinate and utilize the efforts of EOPS staff more efficiently. This chapter also lists and discusses specific recommendations for improvement by college in the areas of program administration, financial aid, outreach/recruitment, counseling, tutoring, other support services, EOPS in-service, funding of EOPS positions, and image/awareness. (EJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED273325

EOPS Operational Program Review:

1984-1985

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. SUKSTORF

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

IC 860 477

Educational Evaluation Associates
9230 Jellico Avenue
Northridge, California 91325
(818) 993-8070

EOPS Operational Program Review: 1984-1985

Report written by

Marvin C. Alkin
Joan Ruskus

September 1985

Prepared for the Chancellor's Office,
California Community Colleges

Presented to

Ron Dyste
Director, Office of
Special Studies

Rod Tarrer
Project Monitor

EEA
Educational Evaluation Associates
9230 Jellico Avenue
Northridge, California 91325

OVERVIEW

This second annual summary report highlights the findings of the EOPS Operational Program Reviews (OPRs) conducted during the 1984-85 academic year. The report has two parts. The first two chapters of the report provide an orientation to the OPR process. Chapters 3 and 4 present the OPR findings and recommendations for improvement.

1. What Is an Operational Program Review? (pp. 1-8) describes the OPR process: its purposes, components and methodology. The demographic characteristics of the EOPS programs reviewed in 1984-85 are summarized.

2. What Does EOPS Do? (pp. 9-19) describes EOPS: its clientele and eligibility criteria; its services, including outreach and recruitment, counseling, tutoring, transfer transition, and financial aid; and its personnel.

3. What Are the Strengths of EOPS Programs? (pp. 20-24) focuses on the strengths of the EOPS programs reviewed in 1984-1985. The most outstanding component of each EOPS program is described.

4. How Can EOPS Be Improved? (pp. 25-40) comprises two parts. The first synthesizes the major themes of the evaluation findings: the need for more thorough documentation of program services, the importance of providing over-and-above services, the impact of campus politics on EOPS programs, and the need to coordinate and utilize the efforts of EOPS staff more efficiently. The second part highlights specific program recommendations, classified into 12 categories.

Chapter 1

WHAT IS AN OPERATIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW?

An Operational Program Review (OPR) is an on-site evaluation of an Educational Opportunity Program and Services (EOPS) program. (See Chapter 2 for a description of the services provided by EOPS.) Each year since 1983-1984, the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges has randomly selected a group of EOPS programs for review. The review is conducted by a three-person team of professionals: a qualitative evaluator, an EOPS administrator from another community college, and a member of the Chancellor's Office staff. The OPR team engages in a variety of tasks -- questionnaire analysis, interviews, observations, and review of documents -- to assess the effectiveness of EOPS programs.

The OPR has two components: a structured evaluation (called the Program Activity Review), which focuses on the achievement of program objectives; and an open-ended qualitative evaluation, which focuses on the program's total impact as perceived by the people experiencing it. Thus, the OPR team can determine both the degree to which the program is actually implementing its plan and the degree to which participants are satisfied with what the program is doing. From the OPR process, the team develops a set of recommendations for program improvement, and prepares a summary report of findings.

This annual summary report synthesizes the information collected by the OPR teams at 22 EOPS programs evaluated between September 1984 and April 1985.

What Is the Purpose of the OPR?

An Operational Program Review has two functions:

1. To provide formative evaluation information to the EOPS director at each college, and
2. To provide descriptive data on EOPS students and programs for systemwide aggregation.

Both the Program Activity Review and the qualitative evaluation component of the OPR supply formative information intended to help programs improve their services. Throughout the OPR process, the team shares evaluation information with the EOPS director and staff and discusses ways in which the program might be strengthened. The recommendations and the thrust of the final OPR findings are communicated to the EOPS staff and the college administration in an exit interview so that programs can initiate needed changes as soon as possible. Experience shows that, by making the presentation to college administrators as well as EOPS staff, the evaluation team can circumvent potential obstacles created by campus politics, thereby expediting the change process.

The OPRs conducted in the fall of 1984 focused on the program plans of 1983-84; those conducted in the spring of 1985 addressed the program plans of 1984-85. In both sets of reviews, the OPR team sought to present its findings in a way that would improve program services in the future.

The Program Activity Review is the primary source of data for the second OPR function, systemwide aggregation of descriptive data. This information is collated by the director prior to the OPR and validated by the OPR team onsite. The data are recorded on special OPR forms and included in the summary reports.

How Is the OPR Conducted?

The OPR process is based on a team approach, with each team member contributing a unique persepctive to the overall evaluation. The team leader (Team Member A), an outside evaluator with special training in naturalistic observation, coordinates the OPR and is responsible for conducting the qualitative component of the review process. Team Member B is selected from the ranks of EOPS program administrators to bring a practical point of view to the evaluation. Team Member C, a program analyst from the Chancellor's Office, has a technical knowledge of EOPS rules and regulations as well as extensive experience in working with EOPS directors on their program plans and budgets. The OPR at each site is conducted by a different team, but all teams use the same evaluation procedures. The site visit to each college lasts two and a half days.

As mentioned earlier, the OPR comprises two components--the Program Activity Review and the qualitative evaluation--conducted simultaneously during the site visit. Each of these components is described in greater detail below.

Program Activity Review. The Program Activity Review is designed to evaluate several aspects of program implementation in relation to the program plan. To assure that each review is tailored to the particular philosophy, objectives, staff and student population of a given EOPS program, the EOPS program plan is used as a starting point for all comparisons. Team Members B and C are responsible for this portion of the evaluation.

One major task of the Program Activity Review is to compare output objectives (section 3.7 of the program plan) and outcome objectives (section 3.8 of the program plan) with actual attainment. Team Members B and C interview program staff to determine if output objectives are being implemented as stated in the plan and if the manner of implementation is acceptable. In addition, they seek to determine whether expected outcome objectives are reasonable, given the output objectives; and they review documentation to support the attainment of specified outcomes.

Another major task of the Program Activity Review is to identify any discrepancies between staff activities as outlined in the program plan and actual staff activities. To this end, staff members are asked about the nature of their EOPS duties and about the amount of time they devote exclusively to these duties.

Qualitative evaluation. The qualitative component of the OPR process, a naturalistic assessment of program function, is designed to evaluate the program as a whole from the point of view of program participants, EOPS staff, and college faculty and staff. Rather than focusing on specific activities, Team Member A allows issues to emerge as people describe their own experiences, satisfactions, and concerns.

Data for the qualitative evaluation come from three sources: the EOPS application (program plan); questionnaires filled out by college faculty, program and college staff, and EOPS students prior to the OPR team's site visit; and interviews with a sample of these and other individuals.

Prior to the site visit, the OPR team studies the EOPS application and prepares a series of questions about aspects of the program which are unclear or which seem particularly interesting. This overview serves as

the context for more specific information collected during the rest of the OPR process.

The second data source is a questionnaire (with separate forms for faculty/staff and for students) which asks respondents to give their opinions on the effectiveness and limitations of the EOPS program (see Appendix A). The EOPS program director distributes these questionnaires prior to the site visit. The completed questionnaires are then forwarded to the evaluator in sealed envelopes, to maintain confidentiality. Generally, about 20 faculty/staff forms and 20 students forms are returned. Team Member A analyzes the questionnaire responses by abstracting comments and categorizing them according to program strengths, weaknesses, disagreements, unique features, and special concerns. Thus, the evaluator gets a preliminary glimpse of program dynamics and can formulate a list of the persons, or kinds of persons, best able to provide relevant information.

Once on site, Team Member A interviews approximately 20-25 persons (EOPS staff, other college staff and faculty, and EOPS students), though the number varies depending on the size of the program and the circumstances. (The other team members conduct their interviews separately.) Guided by the questionnaire analysis, these interviews focus on the individual's perceptions of how the EOPS program operates and whether it does so in an appropriate and effective way. Suggestions for program improvement and problem resolution are encouraged. Because the interview format is open-ended and flexible, the interviewer can explore issues as they emerge and may decide to interview persons not originally scheduled or to reinterview some people in order to learn more about important issues.

In addition to conducting the qualitative portion of the OPR, Team Member A arranges for team members to share their impressions at frequent intervals during the site visit, so that they can benefit from the data collected and can cross-validate their initial observations. Toward the end of the site visit, the team prepares a joint description of the findings and develops specific recommendations, which it shares with the EOPS director and college administrators at an exit visit on the final day.

Shortly after the OPR is completed, the results are summarized in a written report, to which all team members contribute. The Executive Summary, a statement of findings, is a joint effort. Team Members B and C complete the forms required in the Program Activity Review, and the evaluator (Team Member A) writes the qualitative report and coordinates production of the total report, which is then distributed to the EOPS director, the college president and other administrators, the team members, and the Chancellor's Office.

What Were the General Characteristics of the Programs Reviewed in 1984-85?

One of the purposes of the OPR process is to provide the Chancellor's Office with descriptive data on the nature of EOPS programs. These data include student demographic data (e.g., number of students served, gender, age, and ethnicity), educational goals, and high school graduation status. The raw data for each of these variables is tabulated by program in Appendix B. (See Appendix C for a complete list of the programs reviewed in 1984-85.) Team Members B and C are responsible for validating this information which is provided by the EOPS director as part of the Program

Activity Review. From these data, collated across programs, emerges a general profile of the 1984-85 EOPS student population.

Student demographics. The 22 programs enrolled from 98 to 1,084 students, with the majority serving approximately 300 students. Women, many of them single parents, tended to outnumber men (54% of the students were women, 46% were men). Typically, students ranged from 22 to 30 years of age, although several programs were oriented toward younger students, and several others served an older, nontraditional population. Overall, the breakdown of students across age ranges was as follows:

under 18 years	1%
18-21	37%
22-25	22%
26-30	16%
31-35	11%
36 and over	13%

Thus, over half of the students were under 25 years of age.

With respect to ethnicity, the majority of EOPS students were White (37%) or Asian (29%). Hispanics and Blacks were represented nearly equally (15% and 12% respectively). Just 1% of the student population was Native American, while the remaining 5% were of other ethnic groups (or declined to state). Although Whites and Asians accounted for two-thirds of the entire EOPS population, each major racial/ethnic group predominated in at least one program. Whites were the predominant racial/ethnic group in nine of the programs; Asians in six; Blacks in one; and Hispanics in three. (Note that three programs did not supply ethnicity data.)

Student educational goals. The educational goals of students were classified into five categories: vocational education, basic skills, transfer, undecided, or other. Nearly half (49%) of the EOPS students

indicated that they intended to transfer to a four-year college. The next largest group (25%) had vocational goals in mind. A much smaller group (13%) were interested in acquiring basic skills (general education). Relatively few students (11%) were undecided about their educational goals. And only 2% had "other" goals.

High school graduation status. The great majority of EOPS students (71%) had earned a high school diploma, and another 10% had the equivalent. At least 12% had not graduated from high school. The graduation status of the remaining 7% is not known.

General profile. The typical EOPS student is a young (18-21 year-old) white woman, probably a single parent, who has a high school diploma and who intends to transfer to a local four-year college. This is, of course, only a prototypic case; as the data indicate, the demographic and educational characteristics of EOPS students vary. It should also be noted that the distinctive demographic characteristics of the different EOPS programs produced some interesting program variations. For example, several programs focused on the needs of single parents, several had a marked ethnic flavor, and several specialized in reentry assistance.

Chapter 2

WHAT DOES EOPS DO?

The Educational Opportunity Program and Services (EOPS) is a state-funded program designed to give low-income community college students the financial, academic, and psychological support they need to succeed in postsecondary education. It is administered by the Chancellor's Office of the California Community College system. This section sketches a general profile of EOPS: its clientele, its services, and its personnel.

Clientele

The eligibility criteria for participation in EOPS are spelled out in the Title V regulations for the program. To qualify, students must meet one of the following conditions: (1) be a U.S. citizen or permanent resident of the U.S.; (2) have an appropriate visa status; or (3) be in the U.S. for other than a temporary purpose. They must also be enrolled full time and have applied for a Pell grant. If dependent, students must meet all income limitations and must demonstrate that their parents are unable to provide at least half of the financial support they are projected to need. If independent (according to the definition given in the regulations), they must be unable to provide at least half of their support from their own means. (Independent students who receive funds under the Aid for the Families of Dependent Children or the Supplemental Security Income programs are exempted from this provision.) Parents of dependent students may earn no more than $11,999 for a family of four, with $1,000 increments per additional dependent. Eligibility for the participation of independent students is governed primarily by the 50 percent support rule. Thus,

eligibility rules for independent students are generally not as stringent as those for dependent students.

EOPS Services

EOPS programs provide a multitude of services to support students as they pursue their educational and vocational goals. Some of these services are structured as ongoing program components, while others are intangible contributions that bring the program to life and make it meaningful to program participants. The services to be outlined here -- outreach and recruitment, counseling, tutoring, transfer, and financial aid -- were the most prominent services provided by programs reviewed in 1984-85. Other important aspects of the programs are discussed at the conclusion of this section.

Outreach and recruitment. As part of their overall goal of making college attendance a reality for many students who might otherwise not regard postsecondary education as an option, EOPS programs maintain an outreach and recruitment effort in their local service areas. This effort is designed to attract potential EOPS students and to give them the encouragement and information they need in making the decision to attend college. Targeting those areas of the college district that seem to have a preponderance of EOPS-eligible students, EOPS recruiters travel to high schools to meet with counselors and students; they may also visit community centers of various types to describe EOPS opportunities to potentially eligible young people.

Some colleges maintain outreach centers, which are usually located in remote areas of the district or in large urban centers with heavy concentrations of minority and other EOPS-eligible populations, who would

probably be reluctant to travel to the community college without encouragement. EOPS programs usually maintain a presence at these college outreach centers, in the form of EOPS personnel who spend a substantial part of their time at the site, meeting with students who may be eligible for EOPS services. Another manifestation of the outreach and recruitment component, Summer Readiness Programs (short-term orientation sessions for a selected number of college-bound students) offer an excellent opportunity to make contact with potential EOPS participants and to guide them through the difficult transition from high school to college entry. Training in basic study skills and assistance in enrolling in regular summer session courses are features of many of these programs.

Programs vary considerably in the importance they attach to the outreach and recruitment function. In some cases, this function is carried out by a few staff members over a short period of time; in other cases, it is a year-long activity to which a large portion of the program staff's time is devoted.

Counseling. One of the most important EOPS services is student counseling, of which there are four types: academic, career, financial aid, and personal.

The most frequently provided type of counseling, academic counseling, covers four areas. It involves orienting students to the college and to EOPS, assisting them in planning an educational or vocational program, giving them information on transfer to four-year colleges or to more specialized vocational institutions, and monitoring their academic progress. Typically, in the first counseling contact, students receive general information about college life and about participation in EOPS. Thus, they are

informed about program application forms, college deadlines, college activities in which they might be interested, and the location of other services on campus. After students have been oriented, more focused academic counseling is provided. The counselor works one-to-one with the student in developing an educational plan: i.e., identifying an appropriate academic or vocational program of study, specifying the course requirements and time frame of the program, and scheduling classes to fulfill program requirements. Usually, this course and program-related academic counseling involves semester-by-semester assistance.

One very important aspect of academic counseling is making students aware of opportunities to transfer to four-year colleges or advanced vocational programs. Interested students are given information on the curricular offerings and entrance requirements of relevant institutions. Thus, their educational/vocational programs at the community college can be tailored to their transfer goals. Many EOPS programs have developed transfer components that go beyond what is provided in the context of counseling. (Transfer services are discussed separately below.)

Many EOPS progams also monitor student progress. Sometimes such monitoring is informal: the student simply meets regularly with a counselor, and the two converse about how the student is doing. More often, the monitoring is formal and involves computer readouts of the units being carried by the student and of his or her grade-point average, as well as regular written reports sent by instructors to the EOPS office. On the basis of this monitoring effort, counselors may refer EOPS students to other college services, such as the tutoring center, the career counseling center, or the reentry center. Academic monitoring is often the key to student retention.

Career counseling frequently supplements academic counseling, giving EOPS students the opportunity to explore occupational and career options consistent with their abilities and interests. Many programs administer interest inventories (often as part of the EOPS orientation process) to guide students' selection of career paths. Programs with more extensive career counseling components help students to get job descriptions and entry-level salary information; they may even offer training in resume writing and interviewing.

All EOPS programs provide financial aid counseling at some level. Students are informed about the financial aid for which they might be eligible and are given assistance in completing the forms and documentation necessary to determine EOPS eligibility and to get EOPS and other funding. Much of this financial aid counseling takes place before the student is actually enrolled in EOPS; in some cases, it involves high school students planning to enroll in the community college and interested in applying for EOPS. But financial aid counseling is not limited to the beginning of the school year; it is available throughout the year, since many students have recurring questions and must continue to demonstrate their eligibility for subsequent semesters.

The personal counseling offered by EOPS programs ranges all the way from relatively casual and informal student-staff contact, in which students simply talk about whatever is on their minds at the moment, to professional crisis counseling for students with severe personal, financial, or family problems. Because many EOPS students come from low-income families that have no experience with college and can give them little guidance in preparing for college life, and because many EOPS students have low

self-esteem, personal counseling is regarded as a very important component of most EOPS programs contributing to the students' persistence and performance in college.

Tutoring services. Many EOPS students receive inadequate preparation in high school and come to college needing extra assistance in their classes. For these students, tutoring services are available, though their organizational formats vary considerable. In some instances, the college offers tutoring to all students, and EOPS simply refers its students to these services.

In other cases, the EOPS program pays a portion of the total costs of the college's tutoring center or pays the salaries of certain individuals within the tutoring center; this arrangement usually means that EOPS students have available to them tutoring services beyond the level normally provided to college students. In some instances, the EOPS program maintains tutoring services for its own students; usually these are the only such services on campus. In all cases, the tutoring costs the EOPS students nothing. Most frequently, peer-tutors -- students enrolled at the college who have some expertise in the field of study -- are used. In cases where EOPS controlled the tutoring services, the tutors were generally trained and supervised by the EOPS staff. Because the salaries paid to tutors are rarely higher than minimum wage, the programs often have difficulty retaining a capable and dedicated tutoring staff.

Transfer transition. Transfer transition services are designed to help EOPS students transfer to four-year colleges or advanced vocational training programs. Typically, they encompass individualized transfer counseling, assistance in obtaining and completing application forms, and

organized field trips to local universities and vocational programs. These field trips serve to motivate potential transfer students, allowing them to explore new environments while in the company of peers and familiar EOPS staff. Students are often introduced to college administrators and representatives of special programs as part of the field experience. In some instances, EOPS program personnel, acting on behalf of EOPS students who have applied for transfer, maintain regular contact with officials from the prospective receiving institutions.

Financial aid. Given the EOPS eligibility criteria, it is not surprising that one of the purposes of EOPS is to offer students financial aid. Procedures for allocating the financial aid available differ somewhat from program to program. Since the initiation of OPRs, four types of financial aid have been identified: EOPS grants, book grants, emergency loans, and work-study funds. All programs provide EOPS grants, and most provide book loans or book grants. Less frequently, programs provide workstudy money. In only a few cases, are there provisions for emergency loans.

Summary of services. The major services offered by EOPS are: outreach and recruitment, counseling, tutoring, transition, and financial aid. Cutting across these structured services is a concentrated effort by program staff to foster a sense of belonging among students. Although not listed in any program plan, the personal factor is what makes the difference: the dedication, care, and attention that staff members give to students and the responses of students to that special treatment. The following student comments -- representative of many of the comments made on the OPR student questionnaires -- are evidence of the perceived value of the EOPS contribution:

> The staff will drop whatever they're doing to help. Their emotional support is tremendous. The EOPS staff are instrumental in maintaining my self-confidence.
>
> The program staff made reentry after eleven years a pleasure; you don't feel you're alone.
>
> The staff really cares. You are not a number here. I almost dropped out but the director dropped what she was doing and got me on the right track.

The caring environment of the EOPS program stands in sharp contrast to the relative impersonality of the regular college milieu. Because of the individualized attention they receive as part of the services provided by EOPS, nontraditional students -- who might otherwise feel isolated from the mainstream of campus life -- find it easier to adjust to college life.

Although all programs provide a similar core of services, the "personality" of the EOPS programs at different colleges leads to slightly different service emphases. Thus, one program may emphasize outreach and recruitment activities; another may focus on financial aid and eligibility requirements; and a third may give highest priority to academic counseling, tutoring, and basic study skills classes. Several of the programs reviewed this past year provided exemplary outreach and recruitment programs, while a number of others emphasized instructional development (see Chapter 3).

EOPS programs also differ in their allocation of responsibility for the provision of services. Thus, similarly titled staff members at different projects may differ in their responsibilities and modes of operation. For example, counselors in some programs assumed orientation and recruitment functions in addition to counseling functions, while counselors in other programs were limited strictly to counseling. Similarly, the director's responsibility for the different services varied considerably by

program, as did the responsibilities delegated to student workers (e.g., peer advising, tutoring, academic monitoring). The allocation of service responsibilities across EOPS staff dictated individual staff functions as well as the overall pattern of EOPS service provision.

The way in which services are coordinated is also important. EOPS programs are more than a string of services. They embody a spirit and an energy that transcends the provision of specific services. The whole is more than the sum of the parts. EOPS services are intended and designed to reinforce one another, to provide students not only with the financial aid they need because of their low-income backgrounds, but also with the academic support they need because of their poor high school preparation or their long absence from school (i.e., reentry students).

This coordination of services is accomplished in a number of effective ways. In some cases, intense personal involvement is the key. The director or some other staff member makes a point of talking to others in the program to verify that the services are, in fact, reinforcing one another and that students are taking advantage of them. In other programs, coordination is achieved through more formal procedures that assure the interdependence of services. For example, a student's class attendance, counseling contacts, and use of tutoring services may be monitored, via computer checks, in order to assess his/her progress. Frequently, the professional and peer counseling services constitute the monitoring mechanism. That is, checking on the progress of individual students and making referrals (for instance, to tutorial services, to the career placement office) are part of the counselor's regular responsibilities.

Most of the programs observed during the 1984-85 OPRs clearly recognized the need to coordinate services. It was this concern for coordination which typically sets EOPS apart from the rest of the college, giving the EOPS student a sense of belonging that is rare among community college students.

EOPS Personnel

Administratively, most of the EOPS programs reviewed in 1984-85 had a director (or coordinator) and a program secretary. The director (along with a professional-level assistant in several instances) was responsible for administering the program: writing the program plan, maintaining data to demonstrate program compliance, supervising and training members of the program staff, and coordinating program activities and plans with other units on campus. In many cases, the EOPS director was also responsible for the college's financial aid operation. Program administrators were assisted in performing these functions by very able program secretaries, who frequently took personal charge of minor administrative functions.

In every EOPS program, students had access to a professional counselor. In some programs, these certificated personnel served full time and dealt only with EOPS students. More commonly, one or more certificated counselors divided their time between the regular counseling office on campus and the EOPS program.

In most of the EOPS programs, students also had access to a corps of peer counselors: students at the college -- some of them EOPS students themselves -- who acted as advisors, friends, and helpers. These peer counselors were paid by EOPS on an hourly basis and received program training in advisement and counseling methods and in financial aid procedures,

usually through workshops and monthly meetings. In most programs, they worked more closely with EOPS students than did other program personnel, serving as a link between the students and the program services.

Beyond these mainstays -- common to most, if not all, of the programs reviewed -- there were a variety of other EOPS personnel with a diversity of titles: outreach workers, program specialists, student personnel assistants, and sometimes tutors and tutoring coordinators. In addition to the services indicated by their titles, these people also provided many miscellaneous services, acting as a kind of helping hand to the director.

Finally, there were those employees of the college who, while not housed directly within the EOPS program, were nonetheless a part of EOPS through the services they provided to EOPS students. Their titles are far too numerous to list here. These people divided their time between EOPS and other services such as financial aid, tutoring, the career center, the women's center, the reentry center, and services for the disabled. In some cases, their positions were partially funded by EOPS, while in other cases, they were funded solely by the college.

Chapter 3

WHAT ARE THE STRENGTHS OF EOPS PROGRAMS?

Each of the EOPS programs reviewed in 1984-85 had particular areas of strength. While the OPR teams often commended programs for multiple strengths, this summary will highlight only the most outstanding features. (Each of the 22 programs is cited at least once.) Exemplary features are categorized according to EOPS program components.

100 Management Services Component

Porterville College: The program not only maintains accurate, comprehensive documentation of all EOPS activities and services, but also, when possible, notes the impact of EOPS services on individual students and on the college. This documentation gives the director a firm basis for coordinating services and allows peer advisors to keep abreast of EOPS students' academic progress.

San Jose City College: An excellent leader, the EOPS director has established an administrative focus for the program, clarified long-range goals, and forged linkages with the community and the college administration. He has corrected previous program deficiencies and reinstated the program as a viable and accountable entity.

Santa Barbara City College: The program sponsors an imaginative and highly professional series of cultural events -- encompassing various media, speakers, music, and arts forms -- on the campus and in the community. Consistent with the composition of the EOPS student clientele and staff, the series has a multiethnic, multicultural flavor. It constitutes a program support function, with an emphasis on public information.

Oxnard College: The academic alert system developed by this program has proved to be an effective method of tracking student progress and targeting academic counseling and relevant remedial services. The program is computerized and offers a trouble-free method of soliciting input from instructors and giving feedback to inform them of EOPS actions in relation to their evaluative input.

200 Outreach Services Component

Cuyamaca College: The program operates an enthusiastic and comprehensive year-round recruitment program in which the entire EOPS staff is involved: They visit high schools weekly, set up general college

information tables at shopping centers, distribute brochures to libraries and social service agencies, and place EOPS and college posters in the windows of local shops. EOPS personnel are highly committed to recruitment functions, emphasizing low-income populations of all age groups. The vitality of this program component has given the program a high profile in the community.

Santa Ana College: The program runs a Summer Readiness Program that has a tremendous reputation among campus faculty and staff. The program spans six weeks, beginning one week after high school classes end. Participants are given an intensive, highly practical introduction to the college.

College of Marin: The program has established an effective linkage with a Step Two Program in Marin City that provides transition services to disadvantaged students entering college. This community program serves as a conduit for the recruitment of low-income students into the EOPS program.

Coastline Community College: The program plays a prominent role in the South Coast EOPS Consortium, a professional organization that strives to give the underrepresented and the disadvantaged increased access to postsecondary education. (This involvement constitutes a college-integrated recruitment function.) The program's leadership in the consortium gives it local visibility, thereby promoting referrals from community agencies and from other area colleges.

Porterville College: The program sponsors a year-round recruitment program that is broad and creative. Every effort is made to reach the low-income population of the service area. Recruitment techniques include door-to-door home visits, detailed high school presentations, information booths at the welfare and employment offices, and cooperation with community agencies. A unique aspect of the recruitment campaign is the sixth-grade Partnership Program, which sends peer advisors to the elementary schools and brings the children to the college for tours and in-class presentations.

Shasta College: The EOPS director takes an active role in community recruitment efforts, maintaining close ties with a number of community and social services agencies. He has been particularly successful in winning the respect and trust of the leaders of the Native American community in the college's service area.

Victor Valley Community College: The program sponsors a twice-a-year EOPS orientation which introduces new students to the college and to EOPS, giving them valuable information on transfer opportunities and requirements, degree options, and career paths. By involving college staff who were former EOPS students in orientation presentations, the program provides new students with realistic role models at the very beginning of their academic careers.

Chabot College: Regarded by college faculty and staff as one of the most successful aspects of the program, the EOPS Summer Readiness Program teaches prospective students how to use campus resources and how to prepare for college life.

300 Instructional Development and Services Component

Cypress College: The program's tutoring system is outstanding in several respects. It is well known both to EOPS students and to faculty; it provides specialized assistance geared to the needs of EOPS students; tutors are available at convenient times; tutoring efforts are well coordinated with the efforts of other EOPS staff; tutors are preserviced; and tutoring contacts as well documented. Academic program monitoring is closely linked to tutoring efforts, and impressive quantitative data verify effectiveness of tutoring intervention.

Los Angeles Pierce College: The program is responsible for developing and coordinating a highly valuable and widely recognized tutoring service geared toward students with limited English-speaking abilities. Tutoring takes place in a supportive and informal--but structured--environment. Students can practice their conversational English and develop their English-speaking abilities at a comfortable pace, getting individualized attention in problem areas.

Antelope Valley College: The program supports tutoring services for EOPS students through the college's Academic Advancement Center. This excellent facility accommodates individual and group study areas. Tutors are available in all academic areas and most vocational areas. Staff members are friendly as well as knowledgeable about EOPS students, who enjoy over-and-above tutoring via a system for early tutorial referral, extra tutoring time, and special monitoring of EOPS tutoring attendance. Tutoring contacts are well documented by tutoring staff.

400 Counseling Services Component

Solano Community College: The EOPS counselor provides comprehensive counseling and academic advisement exclusively to EOPS students. All students receiving EOPS grants must see the counselor on a monthly basis. Counselor approval is also required for class scheduling each semester. The counselor has good rapport, demonstrating a personal interest in each student. Counseling is highly accessible: available not only for mandatory contacts but also on a walk-in basis. The counselor facilitates coordination between EOPS and the college counseling staff by participating in college counseling functions.

Glendale College: The program has implemented an outstanding intake process that takes the student step by step through college admissions, financial aid, EOPS, and class scheduling procedures. This structured system reinforces student-staff interactions and

demonstrates to students that EOPS can facilitate important paperwork and provide valuable advisement.

College of Alameda: Peer advisors are regarded by staff and student alike as the project's most effective component. They are dedicated, enthusiastic, and well informed, giving students both practical and emotional support. Students depend on peer advisors for information on financial aid and transfer deadlines, advice on which classes and instructors to choose, help with academic problems, and referral to other EOPS and campus services. They are required to meet with peer advisors on a monthly basis, and this contact is tied to disbursement of the EOPS check.

Mission College: The multilingual EOPS staff--composed of both professionals and peers--gives students individualized advisement in all important areas: financial aid, academic planning, progress monitoring, personal counseling, and transfer to four-year colleges. The program director takes a central role in providing academic advising and transfer information. Students are highly appreciative of her availability, stability (compared with college counselors, who seem to come and go), and attention to their individual needs.

American River College: The close working relationship that has developed between the project and the college's counseling office is reflected in the way that flexible release-time schedules are arranged so that counselors can work with EOPS students during the fall orientation and at key points during the year. Concurrent with their orientation, EOPS students receive academic advisement and a first-semester course plan, based on high school transcripts, assessment test scores, and conversations with the counselor. The smoothness of the EOPS-counseling relationship is reportedly attributable to the EOPS director's efforts to form positive personal relationships with counseling staff.

500 Transition Services Component

Diablo Valley College: The program provides a well-rounded transfer program for interested students. Updated information on transfer and scholarships is posted on the EOPS office bulletin boards; notices of visits to Diablo Valley College by four-year school representatives are sent to all EOPS students; and the program sponsors visits to local universities. The EOPS counselor gives specific information and advisement on transfer requirements, programs, transferable units, and so forth.

600 Special Activities Component

Santa Barbara City College: The program sponsors a CARE team that provides critical supplemental support and referral services to a large group of EOPS single parents. The CARE team has established effective coordination with the campus child care center and with the

reentry center. Parents benefit from the personalized attention of CARE staff, who give them practical assistance in handling day-to-day problems.

Oxnard College: The program funds an efficiently run Mini-Corps program that supplements EOPS services for a select group of students. EOPS students who are interested in teaching and working with the children of migrant families are provided with excellent counseling and supervised work experience in local schools that serve migrant students.

700 Financial Aid Coordination Component

Modesto Junior College: There is excellent cooperation and coordination between program staff and the college's financial aid staff. Both are trained in the other's regulations and procedures. A supportive relationship exists between the EOPS director and the Assistant Dean of Student Services (who supervises the financial aid office). The EOPS director and the Dean work together in structuring an appropriate combination of EOPS and other grants, work-study money, child care grants, and small book loans.

College of the Redwoods: The EOPS program enjoys a relaxed, positive relationship with the adjacent financial aid office. The financial aid officer regularly updates EOPS staff on financial aid rules and procedures. The EOPS director takes an active role in financial aid procedures, deciding which EOPS-eligible students should receive grants and work-study money and placing students in work-study positions.

Chapter 4

HOW CAN EOPS BE IMPROVED?

The question of how to improve EOPS can be addressed from two perspectives. The first perspective, a synthesis of the major themes that cut across all 1984-85 OPRs, yields insights into the organization and implementation of EOPS as a whole, suggesting areas that need improvement or modification. The second perspective, a summary of the types of recommendations most frequently made to specific EOPS programs, allows a closer look at the causes of, and possible solutions to, specific problems.

Major Themes of the 1984-95 OPR Findings

The following themes appeared over and over again in the summary reports: the need for more thorough documentation of program services, the importance of providing over-and-above services, the impact of campus politics on EOPS programs, and the need to coordinate and utilize the efforts of EOPS staff more efficiently.

Documentation of program services. If the OPR team is to accomplish its function of comparing the program's actual activities with the activities proposed in the program plan, documented evidence must exist to verify that services have been provided. Time and time again, however, this crucial evidence was spotty or nonexistent. Moreover, documentation is necessary not only for external program review but for internal purposes, such as coordinating multiple services, monitoring levels of service provision, tracking student contact hours, and establishing the effectiveness of program activities. EOPS program documentation was generally deficient in two ways: It was not centralized, and it was not individualized by student.

Documentation of all program activities should be maintained in a central record-keeping system. EOPS programs often maintained documentation according to type of service and housed the documentation in various files or at various campus locations. Besides hindering the coordination of services, such decentralized record keeping made it virtually impossible for the team to determine just what services were being provided, to whom, and how often.

The central file should contain an individual record for each EOPS student, including those not receiving EOPS grants, to document not only the EOPS services provided to the student, but also the services provided by other campus units. Individual records would allow the staff to review a given student's entire program and to evaluate the level of contact hours. These individual records should be cross-referenced with a master record of program services for the purpose of internal monitoring and evaluation.

Deficiencies in documentation were most obvious in the outreach and recruitment area. However, it should be noted that this program component is also the most difficult to track and that there are no clear guidelines for doing so. Consequently, programs often implemented their recruitment programs on the assumption that their efforts paid off in eventual EOPS enrollment, even though they had no data to support this assumption. To determine whether EOPS recruitment is having its intended impact, several links must be established. First, EOPS recruitment contacts should be documented (preferably by type of recruitment activity and name of potential student). Second, contacts should be tracked for college enrollment and EOPS enrollment. Third, any EOPS enrollment that resulted from EOPS

recruitment efforts should be noted as such, so that programs can identify and pursue effective recruitment methods and drop ineffective methods. In addition to improving the recruitment process, documentation should help to clarify which recruitment activities are most successful in attracting EOPS students and which attract non-EOPS students.

Provision of over-and-above services. A great majority of OPR reports highlighted the important issue of "over-and-above" services. This concept is rooted in the California legislature's definition of an extended opportunity program or service as one "which is over, above, and in addition to, the regular educational programs of the college" (EC 69641). All too often, both the colleges and the EOPS programs had overlooked this definition, especially with respect to tutoring.

For example, programs sometimes paid the college for the tutoring services provided to EOPS students when, in fact, they were of the same nature and quality as those provided to general college students as a matter of course: that is, when the tutoring was not specific to the needs of EOPS students or when EOPS students were not given preferential access. In view of the "over-and-above" requirement, this was clearly inappropriate. The problem was not a lack of awareness but, rather, the difficulty of operationalizing the concept. Criteria for "over-and-above" services were often unclear, to both program and college staff, and thus difficult to monitor. Few programs were able to document precisely how much over-and-above tutoring was provided or to link it to a proportionate level of EOPS funding.

Further, the college often charged the EOPS program more than was commensurate with EOPS students' participation in the college's tutoring

program. Most commonly, this meant that the program was paying most or all of the salary of the tutoring center's coordinator/supervisor, even though responsibility for this function was clearly the college's. In some instances, colleges sought to justify inequitable use of EOPS resources by citing their own fiscal difficulties. Obviously, EOPS programs have a stake in assuring that supplemental instructional support is available to their students. But EOPS is not a college bail-out program, and EOPS resources must be reserved for legitimate EOPS services.

In the summary reports, the OPR team discussed ways to correct infractions of the over-and-above requirements, with an awareness that such situations are often politically sensitive. The team pointed out, for instance, that program staff should be thoroughly versed in Title V guidelines as they pertain to EOPS, perhaps through in-service training. Criteria for defining the concept of "over-and-above" should be clearly delineated. Program services should be designed to reflect these criteria, and other college staff members should be informed of these specifications. Finally, procedures for monitoring the provision of over-and-above services should be initiated, with the cooperation of all college personnel who play a role in EOPS service delivery.

Campus politics. Campus politics frequently created discords that interfered with the effective operation of EOPS. But because the source of the discord varied, often involving personality conflicts as well as professional disagreements about policy, generalization is difficult. Putting aside, for the moment, personality issues, one can identify three structural conditions -- all of them involving the relationship between EOPS and other campus units -- that seemed to make a difference: the

nature of the EOPS director/coordinator position, the EOPS director's involvement in campus management activities, and the administrative structure of EOPS vis-a-vis critical supportive services.

First, when the EOPS director/coordinator position was certificated (rather than classified), the director was better able to assert administrative authority. Without such status, coordination of program services was extremely difficult. In cases where the EOPS director was a classified employee and could not supervise certificated EOPS counselors, the counselors frequently seemed to operate independently of the program plan. Directors attributed this problem to the fact that the counselor was not required to report to them, but rather to their certificated supervisor in the college counseling office. When relations between units were good, reporting technicalities presented no particular problem. But when conflicts existed, counselors tended to respond to whoever they felt was "in charge."

Second, the EOPS director's involvement in, or isolation from, campus management activities was a crucial factor. EOPS directors who were regarded as first-level managers by the college were included in college management meetings, and thus had a say in the day-to-day administrative decisions that affected the EOPS program. In such cases, the sense of camaraderie that developed between the director and other administrators was often instrumental in achieving EOPS objectives.

Third, the administrative organization of the college and the placement of the EOPS program within this structure had a pronounced influence on some campuses. When EOPS and related services (such as financial aid and counseling) were subsumed under the same administrative umbrella,

relations between EOPS and these services were facilitated; when EOPS was administratively isolated, coordination was more difficult, conflicts were more common and problems were harded to resolve.

Beyond these structural conditions, the personal qualities of the EOPS directors themselves seemed to facilitate or impede relations across campus. Some directors were able to rally influential advisory committee members around their cause, to penetrate and activate community groups, and to keep the EOPS program in the community and campus eye; in short, they enjoyed the cooperation and enthusiastic support of their colleagues. Conversely, those directors who saw the EOPS program role as "us against them" were unable to muster campus support. It should be noted that, in some cases, an "us against them" mentality may have been justified. Many college administrators view the EOPS program as a potential source of revenue for general college services. In such instances, it is the responsibility of the EOPS director to protect the program's interests by keeping EOPS funding reserved for EOPS functions. To fulfill this responsibility without alienating the rest of the college community, the director must emphasize the other, nonfinancial, contributions of the EOPS program to the general college welfare: increased enrollment, improved retention, and higher frequency of transfer, to name a few. The director's ability to perceive college needs and to market the program as an asset rather than a liability was essential in winning campus acceptance and support for EOPS.

Efficient use of EOPS staff. In the current milieu of declining community college enrollments, tightening fiscal constraints, and increasing external scrutiny of student services programs, it is critical that the efforts of all EOPS staff members be efficiently mobilized and utilized.

The OPR team noted three deficiencies in this regard: poor internal coordination, inadequate in-service training, and underutilization of peer advisors.

On the whole, EOPS staff were viewed as dedicated to their students and thoroughly committed to carrying out their own EOPS roles. Individual staff members, however, were often unaware of what their colleagues were doing and had only a vague idea of the spectrum of activities encompassed within the program plan. This limited perspective led to some duplication of services and inattention to important activities/functions, creating an overall impression of disorganization. Regular staff meetings that include an orientation to the program plan and to the roles of all EOPS staff were recommended to promote better internal organization and coordination.

Almost every summary report mentioned the need for more staff preservice or in-service, with the director playing an active part. The need ranged all the way from clarification of staff roles and responsibilities to structured training in the execution of EOPS functions (such as recruitment, peer advising, and tutoring) and in the procedures associated with related services (such as financial aid). The elements of a comprehensive training program are delineated below in the section on in-service recommendations.

Peer advisors appeared to be an underutilized EOPS resource. In many programs, no clear role had been specified for these students; they simply fulfilled whatever program needs arose, often engaging in clerical functions or non-EOPS-related tasks. The appropriate role of peer advisors should be thoughtfully considered during the program design phase. They should be given preservice training, especially in peer-interaction skills;

supervised by a responsible EOPS staff person, preferably the EOPS counselor; and provided with workspace that allows for confidential communication.

Summary of 1984-85 OPR Recommendations

The executive summary section of the 1984-85 OPR reports included an average of from six to nine recommendations, although some programs received as few as four and some as many as fourteen recommendations. (In one case, the team was unable to review documentation of program services, so no recommendations were made.) Recommendations were reviewed and classified into 12 categories: program administration, outreach/recruitment, counseling, tutoring, financial aid, other support services, EOPS in-service, coordination with college services, funding of EOPS positions, EOPS image/awareness, space, and other recommendations.

To give some sense of the interrelationships among recommendations and of the performance of individual projects, Table 1 lists the entire set of 1984-85 OPR recommendations by category and by program (colleges are not identified by name). This narrative takes a slightly different approach: Each category is examined in order to pinpoint deficiencies and to indicate the corrective measures recommended.

Project administration. This broad category includes all activities pertaining to the administration, management, and day-to-day operations of the EOPS program. Nearly every program received some type of administrative recommendation. Many of these related to the status of the director's position: Programs were advised to upgrade the position or to make it full time. Many other recommendations were directed at the program plan: Programs were advised to reorganize the plan, to edit out non-EOPS staff,

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS: QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

	College A	College B
1. Program Administration	EOPS should strengthen its monitoring of students' academic progress. The program plan should be reorganized and edited to reflect accurate staff allocations.	Frequent staff meetings should be conducted by the program director to encourage greater familiarity with the program plan and staff responsibilities.
2. Financial Aid	EOPS should inform students and staff that EOPS grants and meal tickets are available as alternate forms of financial aid.	
3. Outreach/Recruitment	Recruitment record keeping and follow-up procedures should be strengthened.	Peer advisors and other EOPS staff should be involved in recruitment efforts.
4. Counseling	The full-time counselor position should be filled. At least one EOPS counselor should be housed in the peer advising/tutoring office. IEPs should be developed for all EOPS students.	A single EOPS counselor position is needed. Counselor should develop IEP for each EOPS student.
5. Tutoring	EOPS should reevaluate its committment to the college tutorial center. Peer advisors should keep tutoring functions and record keeping distinct from other services.	Funding of tutoring should be limited to over-and-above service.
6. Other Support Services	The EOPS director should review all procedures for the Summer Academy including recruitment and incentives.	
7. EOPS In-Service	EOPS should provide EOPS peer advisors with training in tutoring techniques.	An intensive, comprehensive training program should be developed for peer advisors. Program secretary should be trained to utilize EOPS personal computer/word processing.
8. Coordination with College Services		EOPS should work with the college to increase the involvement of the President's Advisory Committee on Programs for the Disadvantaged in EOPS.
9. Funding of EOPS Positions	The EOPS director should reexamine the clerical assistant II positions and the EOPS tutor positions to assess the extent of their EOPS-specific functions.	Funding for the position of EOPS director, financial aid clerk, clerk secretary and student office helper should be commensurate with the level of effort devoted exclusively to EOPS functions.
10. EOPS Image/Awareness	The EOPS newsletter should be published more frequently.	
11. Space		
12. Other	The EOPS contract should constitute a separate document and should specify consequences of the students not meeting its provisions.	College should coordinate with the Chancellor's Office in evaluating and restructuring the college's financial commitment to CARE.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS: QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

	College C	College D
1. Program Administration	EOPS should document service provision and contact hours and maintain records in central files. Staff meetings should be conducted regularly.	The data collection system should be used for program planning and monitoring of student progress. College should grant the EOPS director a certified management position.
2. Financial Aid	Students should sign EOPS contract upon receipt of first check. The provision of special grants should be more carefully monitored.	College should consider providing additional financial aid staff to enable the provision of regular financial aid services.
3. Outreach/Recruitment		The recruitment coordinator should concentrate her efforts on EOPS students and document outreach contacts and enrollment.
4. Counseling	School relations specialists should be available to students on an appointment and walk-in basis. An IEP should be developed for each EOPS student.	The appropriateness of the counselor's involvement in the "El Centro" office should be reevaluated. The peer advisor's role should be restructured to support the counselor.
5. Tutoring		College tutoring should be more clearly differentiated from EOPS over-and-above tutoring.
6. Other Support Services	EOPS orientation for new students should be mandatory and take place within the first two weeks of each semester.	
7. EOPS In-Service	EOPS staff should be trained in financial aid procedures. Tutors should be trained.	
8. Coordination with College Services		
9. Funding of EOPS Positions	The personnel worker position should be dropped from the plan since the functions of this position are handled by financial aid.	
10. EOPS Image/Awareness	EOPS students should be informed of program services in writing when they are notified of eligibility. College faculty/staff should be made aware of EOPS goals and activities.	
11. Space	The EOPS office should be clearly identified as such by visible signs.	College should provide contiguous space for the college tutoring center and the EOPS program.
12. Other	EOPS should reexamine the appropriateness of supporting the EOPS Enrichment course.	The job descriptions of the college clerk III position should reflect program needs. An EOPS advisory committee should be established.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS: QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

	College E	College F
1. Program Administration	A program strategy should be planned to address the needs of EOPS students. The program plan should be updated, revised to include only personnel who perform EOPS functions.	The program assistant position should be expanded to a full-time position.
2. Financial Aid		The EOPS coordinator should be involved in the selection of EOPS-eligible students for EOPS grants.
3. Outreach/Recruitment		District should contribute greater proportion of funds to recruitment. Efforts should focus on EOPS services, target potentially eligible EOPS students, and be systematically followed up.
4. Counseling		Student referrals to counseling should be followed up.
5. Tutoring	A pool of tutors should be available to meet tutoring needs. Tutoring efforts should be confined to EOPS students.	Student referrals to tutoring should be followed up.
6. Other Support Services		Peer advisors should see all EOPS students on a regular basis. The Book Loan Program should be expanded.
7. EOPS In-Service	The director should inform staff of their specific EOPS functions, provide training to help them and acquaint them with the EOPS plan.	Peer advisors should be trained in peer-advising techniques and financial aid procedures, EOPS staff should be trained in use of district data system.
8. Coordination with College Services	EOPS services should be coordinated with college instructional services.	EOPS should coordinate with the college in developing recruitment follow-up system. EOPS should coordinate with financial aid to identify students on academic probation.
9. Funding of EOPS Positions	Funding for the positions of special program asst and typist/clerk should be commensurate with the level of effort devoted exclusively to EOPS.	
10. EOPS Image/Awareness	Students should be made aware of EOPS services. Activities should be planned to bring students together. EOPS should publicize its services.	
11. Space		
12. Other		

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS: QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

	College G	College H
1. Program Administration	Staff meetings should be held on a regular basis.	The program assistant position should be upgraded to a full-time, year-round position. The current EOPS academic monitoring system should be included in the program plan.
2. Financial Aid		EOPS should change the name of its "book grant" to reflect its general purpose.
3. Outreach/Recruitment		All recruitment efforts should be documented and followed up. The necessity for two recruiter positions should be reevaluated.
4. Counseling	The EOPS counselor should report directly to the EOPS director. The counselor should be more directly involved in all aspects of peer advising	EOPS should work with college counselors in developing educational plans for EOPS students.
5. Tutoring	The tutor coordinator position should be converted to a full-time classified position. College should provide partial financial support.	EOPS should establish a tutorial service, utilizing EOPS personnel in the English department's learning center.
6. Other Support Services	The peer advising coordinator position should be converted to a full-time classified position.	EOPS should design, implement a peer advising component. A system for early identification of transfer students should be developed. Orientation should be mandatory for new students.
7. EOPS In-Service	Training for tutors should be continued and supplemented with periodic in-service. Training for peer advisors should include financial aid procedures.	Peer advisors should be trained by college counselors. EOPS should request training from the Chancellor's Office in EOPS eligibility determination and validation of needs statistics.
8. Coordination with College Services	The Vice President of Student Personnel Services should work with the EOPS director, counselor, & financial aid director to facilitate services.	EOPS should consolidate intake, eligibility and book grant procedures with the financial aid office and should exchange information with college counselors regarding services provided to EOPS students.
9. Funding of EOPS Positions		
10. EOPS Image/Awareness		
11. Space	EOPS should utilize existing office space more efficiently. College should help to identify additional space for EOPS.	
12. Other		The EOPS advisory committee should be reactivated.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS: QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

	College I	College J
1. Program Administration		Regular staff meetings should be conducted to coordinate staff efforts and solicit input for planning purposes. College should clarify the status of the position held by the individual directing the EOPS program.
2. Financial Aid		
3. Outreach/Recruitment	EOPS should design and implement an on-campus recruitment effort.	The EOPS director should be more actively involved in recruitment efforts. Recruitment efforts should be accelerated and focused on the Hispanic population.
4. Counseling	A personal counseling activity should be developed to supplement academic counseling. EOPS counselors should design and implement a mid-semester student progress monitoring system.	EOPS and the counseling department should cooperate in determining the assignment of counselors to EOPS, the level of counseling provided, and the scheduling of counseling.
5. Tutoring		
6. Other Support Services		
7. EOPS In-Service	Clerk-typist should be given training in secretarial functions and use of the EOPS personal computer. Other opportunities for professional development should be made available.	The EOPS director should take a more active role in training program staff. Periodic training should be provided for nonprogram staff to apprise them of EOPS functions which affect them.
8. Coordination with College Services	EOPS should work more closely with financial aid in needs statistics, eligibility determination, referral to EOPS, and grant awards.	EOPS should coordinate services with related college services and exchange information on student progress.
9. Funding of EOPS Positions		
10. EOPS Image/Awareness		A public relations campaign should be launched to familiarize college faculty and staff with the needs of EOPS students and the range of EOPS services provided.
11. Space		
12. Other	The EOPS advisory committee should be representative of all geographic areas and population segments of the college's service area.	

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS: QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

	College K*	College L
1. Program Administration	The Chancellor's Office should fully examine compliance issues within this program.	The EOPS coordinator should report directly to the Dean of Student Development Serivces.
2. Financial Aid		
3. Outreach/Recruitment		Recruitment activities should be focused around reaching the area's low-income population. The Summer Readiness Program should target graduating high school seniors.
4. Counseling		The EOPS counselor position should be expanded beyond 10 hours per week and should encompass a broader range of counseling activities, including student advisor training.
5. Tutoring		
6. Other Support Services		
7. EOPS In-Service		EOPS staff should be provided with more opportunities for professional growth and receive training from other college services in relevant areas. EOPS should provide training to college faculty/staff in EOPS procedures.
8. Coordination with College Services		EOPS and financial aid should cooperate in broadening the identification and designation of "EOPS-eligible" students to include all students who meet the income criteria for EOPS services.
9. Funding of EOPS Positions		
10. EOPS Image/Awareness		
11. Space		College should provide EOPS with more space. Areas within the EOPS office should be set aside for confidential staff-student contacts.
12. Other		The EOPS advisory committee should be activated as soon as possible. Goals for the committee and responsibilities of committee members should be clarified.

* The OPR team was unable to formulate specific recommendations for the program due to its many concerns about the provision of services as stated in the program plan and the inability of the team (in the two-and-a-half day visit) to obtain the necessary documentation to substantiate its concerns.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS: QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

	College M	College N
1. Program Administration	The EOPS director should review and revise the program plan regarding clarity and consistency of outcome statements, relevance of activities, and appropriateness of personnel included.	The EOPS director should update the program plan to reflect new directions the program is taking. More frequent meetings of program staff should be held.
2. Financial Aid		
3. Outreach/Recruitment		
4. Counseling		Academic advising should be focused on students who have been identified as "at risk" academically.
5. Tutoring	EOPS should reassess EOPS students' actual need for tutoring using multiple sources of information.	EOPS should develop a process that will expedite the identification of EOPS students for tutoring purposes. The tutoring component should be redesigned to ensure that over-and-above services are provided.
6. Other Support Services	EOPS should develop a more unified set of transfer activities, including early identification of transfer students and early advisement pertaining to transfer requirements.	Efforts to retain EOPS students who demonstrate poor academic performance should be accelerated.
7. EOPS In-Service		EOPS director should develop and implement regular ongoing staff training in areas relevant to program objectives and in financial aid procedures. The director should clarify the specific functions of each EOPS staff member.
8. Coordination with College Services		The EOPS director should work with the financial aid supervisor in developing a process of efficient communication of EOPS income eligibility.
9. Funding of EOPS Positions	Funding for tutorial center coordinator and clerk-typist/financial technician I should be commensurate with the level of effort devoted exclusively to EOPS functions.	Funding of positions which are dedicated to other college services should be discontinued. Funding for job resources clerk and tutorial clerk typist should be commensurate with the level of effort devoted exclusively to EOPS.
10. EOPS Image/Awareness		
11. Space	The program aides' office should remain near the college's tutorial center and be partitioned for confidential staff-student contacts.	College should work with EOPS director in identifying more adequate space for the program.
12. Other	EOPS should consider ways to extend EOPS services to eligible students who do not have EOPS grants.	Student workers should be reclassified into EOPS positions that reflect their actual functions.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS: QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

	College O	College P
1. Program Administration	The EOPS coordinator position should be upgraded to "classified manager" and renamed "director".	The EOPS director position should be full time. The director and program assistant positions should be filled as soon as possible. Record keeping should be improved in all program areas.
2. Financial Aid	The EOPS director should be more involved in awarding grants and work-study funds. A clerical position should be created to expedite paperwork to potential EOPS-eligible students.	
3. Outreach/Recruitment		EOPS should design and implement an EOPS-specific recruitment/outreach function targeted toward the college and the community.
4. Counseling	An EOPS counselor position should be created to provide personal and career counseling to EOPS students.	The EOPS counselor should serve EOPS students only and provide counseling in the EOPS office. The counselor should be directly involved in the training and supervision of peer advisors.
5. Tutoring	EOPS and the college should examine the level of over-and-above tutoring provided to EOPS students by the college tutoring service. EOPS should limit its funding of tutoring to over-and-above.	EOPS should discontinue payment for tutoring of EOPS students at the college's learning assistance center.
6. Other Support Services	EOPS should obtain informational materials related to transfer requirements of local four-year colleges and universities.	EOPS should design and implement a comprehensive academic and career transition activity. The number of EOPS peer advisors should be expanded, and their duties should be broader.
7. EOPS In-Service	EOPS should develop a formal preservice training program for peer advisors. In coordination with the local four-year college, EOPS should develop an in-service for the EOPS-college liaison.	EOPS should develop a formalized peer advisor training program which would include financial aid procedures.
8. Coordination with College Services		The EOPS director should work with other campus units to coordinate records of services to EOPS students provided outside the program.
9. Funding of EOPS Positions	Funding for the position of tutorial coordinator should be commensurate with the level of effort devoted exclusively to EOPS functions.	
10. EOPS Image/Awareness	EOPS should publicize the program more on campus and distribute the newsletter more widely, both on campus and in the community.	EOPS should publish a newsletter, and the director should make more frequent personal contacts with college faculty and staff to increase college awareness of the program.
11. Space		
12. Other	The EOPS director should be included in the purchasing of software for the EOPS/financial aid computer.	

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS: QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

	College Q	College R
1. Program Administration	Program plan should be reviewed and revised for accuracy, consistency, and quality of outcome statements. Need better procedures for documenting student contacts and service provision.	The EOPS director should directly oversee program operations, or the EOPS coordinator position should be upgraded to enable that position to supervise all program staff. Regular staff meetings should be held.
2. Financial Aid		
3. Outreach/Recruitment	College should consider developing and funding its own outreach recruitment efforts or coordinate efforts with EOPS.	College should coordinate campuswide recruitment effort directed at the Hispanic population.
4. Counseling		A full-time counselor should be assigned to EOPS and stationed in the EOPS area.
5. Tutoring		
6. Other Support Services		
7. EOPS In-Service	The new outreach specialist should be given an in-service in EOPS outreach goals. All EOPS staff should be in-serviced in financial aid procedures.	A comprehensive staff development component should be developed that would include an overview of the EOPS plan, specific job responsibilities of each EOPS position, and methods to implement EOPS services.
8. Coordination with College Services	EOPS and financial aid should work to increase information flow between offices and coordinate efforts in improving the quality and availability of computerized data.	College should facilitate coordination between EOPS and the counseling department. EOPS recruitment efforts should be coordinated with college recruitment.
9. Funding of EOPS Positions		All EOPS staff positions (particularly in the learning center) should be reexamined by the college to determine the appropriate level of funding given Title V guidelines.
10. EOPS Image/Awareness		
11. Space		
12. Other		

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS: QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

	College S	College T
1. Program Administration	EOPS should maintain a central, individual file for every EOPS student, including academic records and documentation of services. Activities/functions should be written for all current EOPS activities.	EOPS director should be more directly involved in all EOPS operations. The duties of the EOPS secretary/program assistant should be clarified and a permanent replacement should be named. The distribution of EOPS funds should be reexamined.
2. Financial Aid		EOPS director should take more responsibility in determining EOPS financial eligibility and the EOPS grants process. EOPS students should be informed of emergency and book loans and procedures related to their provision.
3. Outreach/Recruitment		New recruitment strategies should be developed to recruit minority students. Peer counselors and Hispanic recruiters should be involved. Recruitment efforts should be documented and follow-up procedures initiated.
4. Counseling	A full-time counselor should be made available to the EOPS program. Counseling activities/functions in the program plan should be rewritten to clarify the nature of services provided by various staff.	The EOPS counselor should be clearly identified as such, and all EOPS counseling should take place in the EOPS office. Counseling should be available to EOPS students on both a walk-in and appointment basis.
5. Tutoring		EOPS director should determine the extent of over-and-above tutoring provided to EOPS students and adjust EOPS funding accordingly.
6. Other Support Services		EOPS should implement its planned twice-a-year orientation for EOPS students and this should be mandatory for first-time EOPS students.
7. EOPS In-Service	In-service should be provided to college tutors to familiarize them with the EOPS program and the multicultural nature of the student population.	Peer counseling training should emphasize EOPS and recruiters should be oriented to EOPS procedures. EOPS and financial aid should train each other's staff in relevant procedures.
8. Coordination with College Services	EOPS should work with the director of tutorial services in designing and implementing an in-service for tutors. The tutorial director should participate in EOPS staff meetings.	EOPS director and the financial aid manager should coordinate efforts in in-servicing staff of both units. Procedures related to book loans should be communicated to book store staff.
9. Funding of EOPS Positions		Funding for the EOPS secretary/program assistant position should be commensurate with the level of effort devoted exclusively to EOPS functions.
10. EOPS Image/Awareness	The EOPS newsletter should be more widely distributed in the community and at local high schools.	EOPS should take steps to raise on-campus awareness of the program and its services.
11. Space	Additional space should be assigned to peer advisors. Some of this space should be reserved for confidential staff-student contact.	
12. Other	The EOPS director should reevaluate the workscope of the special programs advisor position. The EOPS student contract should be signed by the EOPS staff member who explains it to the student.	The EOPS director should design a student contract and specify appropriate signatures. The advisory committee should expand its membership to better represent all relevant ethnic groups.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS: QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

	College U	College V
1. Program Administration		The EOPS/special services director position should be upgraded to a certified position and the EOPS specialist/program assistant position should be upgraded to coordinator.
2. Financial Aid		EOPS grants should be separated from the book voucher system. This semester's grants should be distributed immediately,and parking fees should not be automatically deducted from the grants.
3. Outreach/Recruitment	EOPS should develop a recruiting activity and hire an individual to carry it out.	EOPS and the college should fund a classified recruiter position for high school and community recruitment. The EOPS specialist and peer advisors should be more involved in recruitment efforts.
4. Counseling	The EOPS counselor should develop a written IEP for each EOPS student.	A full-time EOPS counselor position should be established for the exclusive use of EOPS students. The counselor should report to the EOPS director and be located in the EOPS office.
5. Tutoring		
6. Other Support Services	EOPS should design and implement a broad peer advising activity. EOPS should implement an assessment system for all entering EOPS students.	Peer advisors should see students both on an appointment basis and on a walk-in basis.
7. EOPS In-Service	Periodic in-service training in financial aid procedures should be provided to all EOPS staff.	EOPS should implement a formal preservice training program for peer advisors. All EOPS staff should be in-serviced in financial aid procedures.
8. Coordination with College Services	EOPS should send written progress reports of EOPS students to college instructors. The EOPS director should work more closely with financial aid on early identification and referral to EOPS.	
9. Funding of EOPS Positions		Funding for positions of special services receptionist/secretary and account technician I should be commensurate with the level of effort devoted exclusively to EOPS functions.
10. EOPS Image/Awareness		A broader informational effort should be conducted on campus to publicize EOPS.
11. Space		The EOPS peer advisors should be provided with a permanent work area adjacent to other EOPS staff that can accommodate confidential staff-student contacts.
12. Other	The EOPS student contract should be rewritten to reflect current EOPS policies, procedures. EOPS should reexamine its sponsorship of the college readiness basic skills course, or redesign it.	A full-time special services receptionist/secretary position should be created and filled immediately. The special services office should adjust its hours to allow staff to catch up on necessary paperwork.

and to make sure that the written plan coincided with actual program activities. Coordination and communication among staff members was another major concern: More frequent and more structured staff meetings were almost universally needed. As indicated earlier, documentation of services and contact hours was often inadequate; thus, programs were advised to tighten documentation procedures and to centralize student files.

The thrust of these administrative recommendations conveys a need to plan and execute the EOPS program more carefully. Deficiencies in the program plan and in documentation of activities reveal a haphazard approach to program implementation. The fact that staff members are poorly informed and uncoordinated in their efforts shows poor management. Perhaps the directors are not well trained for management tasks (many complained of the lack of in-service for directors) or do not have the administrative "clout" to carry out their responsibilities. The requirement that EOPS directors be certificated will improve the administrative status of the director's position, but having the necessary authority to supervise and coordinate staff is only part of the problem -- directors also need to know what to do. The annual EOPS conference, sponsored by the Chancellor's Office, has served as one source of in-service training for EOPS administrators. By participating in workshops on management skills, Title V regulations, implementation of program components, special services, program budgeting, and preparation of the program plan, EOPS directors get specific guidance in how to administer their programs. Perhaps directors should also receive management training of a more general nature, such as that sponsored by management consultants or local colleges and universities. Alternatively, the Chancellor's Office might consider providing individual or small-group

training focused on specific management skills or on those EOPS administrative functions that are generally weak (e.g., program planning, program monitoring, and documentation of services). In addition to strengthening the administrative know-how of EOPS directors, such in-service would allow directors, in turn, to provide higher-quality in-service to their own staff.

Outreach/recruitment. Fifteen of the 22 programs reviewed were advised to improve their recruitment activities. More specifically, the recommendations in this category dealt with the need to involve a wide array of EOPS staff (especially peer advisors) in recruitment activities, the need to improve documentation of recruitement activities (discussed above), and the need to follow up recruitment efforts. In several instances, the OPR team recommended that recruitment efforts be focused on a particular population: minorities (particularly Hispanics) or low-income groups.

The recruitment problems most pertinent to the overall effectiveness of the EOPS program are the lack of documentation and the failure to follow up recruitment activities. As discussed earlier, these functions are instrumental in establishing the relationship between activities and outcomes. Without adequate follow-up and documentation, the impact of recruitment activities can be neither assessed nor demonstrated. Better documentation would also indicate which recruitment efforts are most effective and thus would serve as a basis for better allocation of resources.

Counseling. Seventeen EOPS projects were given one or more recommendations about counseling. One reason for the high frequency of recommendations in this area is that the programs often had to rely on general

college staff to provide counseling services to EOPS students, and this arrangement created tension. Therefore, the OPR team recommended, for example, that a full-time counselor position be created for the exclusive use of EOPS students, that EOPS counselors be required to report directly to the EOPS director, and that EOPS counseling be provided in the EOPS office rather than in the college counseling center.

All of these recommendations reflect efforts to shift control of counseling to the EOPS program. So pervasive is the problem of control that it would seem appropriate to build into the EOPS legislation some guarantee that the programs will be able to hire and supervise their own counselors, independent of the college's counseling center. Such a provision would allow the EOPS director to hire and schedule counselors in a manner that best meets the needs of EOPS students and to guarantee the provision of over-and-above services. But it is also important to assure that EOPS counselors are not isolated from the rest of the counseling staff. One college solved this problem by involving members of the regular counseling staff in the selection of EOPS counselors, who were then accepted as associates and invited to attend counseling department meetings.

Tutoring. Twelve of the EOPS programs were given recommendations pertaining to tutoring, many of them concerned with the over-and-above provision. As was pointed out earlier, programs frequently seemed to be overpaying the college for tutoring services. Thus, EOPS programs were advised to define over-and-above tutoring more explicitly, to tighten procedures for monitoring the provision of this extra tutoring, and to reassess the financial contribution of EOPS to college tutoring centers.

The confusion surrounding over-and-above tutoring is attributable to a general misunderstanding of the Title V legislation. For instance, college administrators often pressure the EOPS program to contribute funds for tutoring services that should be provided as a matter of course. Thus, it appears that both EOPS directors and college administrators could benefit from a Chancellor's Office in-service designed to clarify the intent of Title V and to provide more definitive guidelines for what constitutes "over-and-above" as related to tutoring. Until this is done, programs (and colleges) will continue to interpret this requirement in ways which either do not meet Title V guidelines or do not fully provide for the needs of EOPS students, or both.

Financial aid. Although many programs received financial-aid-related recommendations (e.g., for better coordination between financial aid and other services), relatively few were actually deficient in the way they handled this function. The recommendations in this category often involved informing students of their financial aid options and of procedures for getting financial aid. Another cluster of recommendations called for the more active involvement of the director in determining financial aid eligibility and distributing EOPS grant funds.

The lack of adequate student orientation to financial aid options and procedures is a fairly straightforward problem with clear remedies. However, the director's lack of involvement in financial aid reflects a more complex problem (touched on above): inadequate administrative control over a critical EOPS service. This problem often has the same roots as the management problem discussed earlier: the director's lack of training or lack of administrative clout.

Other support services. Recommendations in this category covered a broad array of EOPS services not subsumed in other categories: namely, the use of peer advisors, the need for transition activities, and the need to orient new EOPS students more thoroughly. For instance, the OPR team often suggested that peer advisors be involved in more EOPS activities, particularly recruitment, and that they be more readily accessible to all EOPS students. Transition activities, when present, were generally undeveloped, so programs were urged to improve their procedures for identifying and serving transfer-eligible EOPS students. Because efforts to orient new students to the program were frequently unstructured and irregular, the team often recommended that orientation be provided on a regular basis and made mandatory for new students.

EOPS in-service. The OPR team noted the need for EOPS in-service in 19 programs. The most frequently recommended solution was comprehensive training for all EOPS staff. Such an approach would entail an overview of Title V guidelines, a review of the program plan, specification of EOPS roles and delineation of the responsibilities attached to each role, training in specific job-related tasks, training in college financial aid procedures, and training in the use of computerized data systems. EOPS staff members were also urged to take advantage of any outside opportunities for professional development. In addition to recommending in-service for EOPS staff, the team often recommended that EOPS provide in-service training in EOPS procedures for college staff, particularly financial aid staff. The purpose of such training would be to broaden awareness of the program and its goals and to facilitate efficient provision of services to EOPS students.

The need for in-service training has obvious ramifications for the effectiveness of the overall EOPS program. Apparently some program directors do not recognize this need, do not have the skills to provide in-service themselves, or do not have the necessary funds to bring in outside trainers. Directors should be alerted to the potential need for in-service as part of their own training (see above) and should be provided with a set of general training materials (covering basic EOPS roles, Title V, and so forth). In addition, when programs submit their annual plans, the Chancellor's Office should make sure that the budgets allow for some in-service activities.

Coordination with college services. Fifteen projects received recommendations highlighting the need to coordinate EOPS activities with those of related college services. Especially marked was the need for better communication between the EOPS program and the financial aid unit. Therefore, the OPR team recommended that EOPS work with the financial aid unit in developing better income eligibility criteria, in streamlining the referral process, in coordinating data collection and retrieval, in developing a computerizied data base, in streamlining the EOPS grants process, and in developing complementary in-service programs. Other areas frequently targeted for improved coordination with college units were counseling and outreach/recruitement.

Funding of EOPS positions. Ten of the 22 EOPS programs funded some EOPS positions at a level higher than was warranted by the EOPS services provided. Although the nature of the suspect positions varied, many were related to tutoring. In cases where EOPS appeared to support positions dedicated exclusively to other college services, it was recommended that

the program discontinue funding as soon as possible. In all other instances, the team recommended that the functions of the position be carefully reviewed and that funding be made commensurate with the amount of effort devoted exclusively to EOPS.

EOPS image/awareness. The OPR team noted the need to increase awareness of EOPS services both among EOPS students themselves and in the broader college community. Thus, it often recommended that EOPS students be informed of the services available to them as soon as they are notified of their EOPS eligibility and that efforts be made to bring EOPS students together to promote a positive, supportive EOPS image. In addition, increased awareness of EOPS on campus should be promoted by establishing more personal contacts between EOPS staff and college faculty staff, by distributing the EOPS newsletter more regularly and to a wider range of readers, and by structuring in-services to familiarize others with EOPS.

Space. Eight of the 22 programs had space problems that were serious enough to merit OPR recommendations. The most common problem was overcrowding, so it was recommended that college administration provide more adequate space for EOPS personnel. In other instances, EOPS space was indistinguishable from the space occupied by other college units sharing the office area, so the team recommded clearer demarcation.

Other recommendations. Most of the recommendations subsumed in this category pertained to the advisory committee, the EOPS student contract, or EOPS support of peripheral programs and courses. Advisory committees often existed "in name only" or did not accurately represent relevant constituencies. Some student contracts were not explicit enough about what the student's responsibilities as an EOPS participant would be. Some programs

funded special activities that did not adequately address the needs of EOPS students. Appropriate recommendations were made in each of these areas.

Appendix A
Sample OPR Questionnaire

EOPS
Operational
Program
Review

Confidential Faculty/Staff Questionnare

Directions: Please answer the following questions. To maintain confidentiality, please seal your completed questionnaire in the attached envelope. Sealed questionnaires will be read by an EOPS review team and will not be shown to local students, staff, or administrators. Please be candid -- your comments can help to improve the EOPS project.

Thank you.

1. In what ways do you feel the EOPS project has been of greatest benefit to students?

2. Describe one part of the EOPS project here that you feel works particularly well.

Why do you think it's effective?

3. Describe one part of the EOPS project here that is in need of improvement.

Why do you think it needs to be improved (what's wrong with it)?

Faculty and College Staff:

Please indicate your primary area of responsibility:
Math/Science ___ English/Language ___ Vocational Education ___
Health/Physical Education ___ Social Science ___ Fine Arts ___
Student Services ___ Administration ___ Other _____

EOPS Staff:

In which EOPS activities do you have responsibilities (e.g., tutoring, counseling, administration, outreach, etc.)?
(specify) _____
_____

Your name _____ (optional)

EOPS
Operational
Program
Review

Confidential Student Questionnaire

Directions: Please answer the following questions. To maintain confidentiality, please seal your completed questionnaire in the attached envelope. Sealed questionnaires will be read by an EOPS review team and will not be shown to local students, staff, or administrators. Please be candid -- your comments can help to improve the EOPS project.

Thank you.

1. In what ways do you feel the EOPS project has been of greatest benefit to you?

2. Describe one part of the EOPS project here that you feel works particularly well.

Why do you think it's effective?

3. Describe one part of the EOPS project here that is in need of improvement.

Why do you think it needs to be improved (what's wrong with it)?

Please specify your major area of study _____

Please indicate services you have received from EOPS:

Financial Aid ___ Counseling ___ Tutoring ___ Recruitment ___
Employment Assistance ___ Childcare ___ Transportation ___

Your name _____ (optional)

Appendix B

Student Demographic Data, Educational Goals, and
High School Graduation Status of the 1984-85
EOPS Student Population

Student Demographic Data, Educational Goals, and
High School Graduation Status of the 1984-85 EOPS Student Population

	College A	College B	College C	College D	College E	College F	College G	College H	College I	College J	College K	College L	College M	College N	College P	College Q	College R	College S	College T	College U	College V	TOTAL	%
GENDER:																							
Males	238	91	45	352	31	68	228	181	---	169	476	56	477	126	112	147	294	224	25	54	61	3455	46
Females	301	130	125	318	43	43	232	150	---	143	548	42	607	164	164	127	247	268	75	156	197	4080	54
AGE:																							
Under 18	14	0	1	0	0	0	5	3	---	0	5	2	30	1	1	8	25	1	0	1	0	97	51
18-21	223	79	54	270	7	21	165	189	---	128	418	57	339	147	51	92	298	126	10	42	28	2744	37
22-25	104	49	23	163	15	19	120	62	---	81	235	19	229	51	51	32	176	141	27	39	39	1674	22
26-30	90	38	35	109	15	25	74	34	---	53	136	11	197	39	65	40	25	103	14	55	66	1224	16
31-35	46	27	27	56	10	23	52	18	---	25	78	3	133	23	65	52	13	72	19	37	55	826	11
36+	62	28	30	72	27	23	44	25	---	25	153	6	156	29	42	50	4	49	29	36	70	960	13
ETHNICITY:																							
White, Caucasian	40	109	100	143	39	55	133	173	---	104	805	5.5	434	66	37	19	38	189	64	85	182	2820.5	38
Black	321	22	33	124	1	4	25	33	---	16	39	1	43	42	11	27	18	37	11	60	27	895	12
Hispanic	40	7	14	61	7	11	57	16	---	19	34	6.5	206	145	192	52	27	192	5	31	42	1154.5	15
Asian, Pacific Islands	123	78	10	231	15	37	194	81	---	140	99	84.5	347	35	17	160	444	64	10	21	4	2194.5	29
Native American	6	3	6	11	2	4	4	4	---	0	8	0	22	2	17	3	2	9	5	4	1	113	1
Filipino	---	---	---	---	---	---	43	---	---	---	---	---	---		---	---	---	---	---	---	---	43	
Other/Decline to State	21	2	6	100	10	0	4	24	---	33	40	.5	32	0	2	13	12	1	7	9	2	318.5	5
EDUCATIONAL GOALS:																							
Number of students primarily oriented toward Vocational Education	172	19	41	24	6	8	155	12	---	103	5	7	---	29	---	13	27	56	44	108	74	947	25
Basic Skills (General Ed.)	---	21	12	209	0	1	22	5	---	3	5	0	---	38	---	43	46	30	6	16	31	488	13
Transfer	352	64	69	104	3	18	260	97	---	209	24	79	---	87	---	37	101	145	29	66	141	1885	49
Undecided	18	3	16	261	2	4	23	3	---	0	2	8	---	13	---	7	2	17	13	20	10	422	11
Other	9	0	0	6	0	0	---	0	---	0	2	37	---	0	---	0	8	0	0	0	2	64	02
HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION:																							
High School Diploma	469	149	123	445	55	13	440	164		284	796	82	---	174	---	---	199	354	67	154	194	4162	71
Equivalent	9	17	21	22	8	12	15	14	---	9	130	0	---	19	---	---	199	37	11	26	26	560	10
Non-Graduate	73	50	26	55	10	6	5	16	---	19	86	4	---	66	---	---	142	93	0	24	13	688	12
No Data Available	---	5	0	98	1	0	---	202	---	---	13	12	---	31	---	---	1	8	24	6	25	426	07

Appendix C

Programs Reviewed in 1984-85

Regions 1

College of the Redwoods
Shasta College

Region 2

American River College
Solano Community College

Region 3

College of Alameda
Diablo Valley College
College of Marin

Region 4

Chabot College
Mission College
San Jose City College

Region 5

Modesto Junior College
Porterville College

Region 6

Antelope Valley College
Oxnard College
Santa Barbara City College

Region 7

Glendale College
Los Angeles Pierce College

Region 8

Coastline Community College
Cypress College
Santa Ana College

Region 9

Victor Valley College

Region 10

Cuyamaca College

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges
OCT 10 1986